

Jeffrey A. Nein, AICP
(703) 456-8103
jnein@cooley.com

BY HAND DELIVERY

January 27, 2009

Stephen Gardner
Project Manager
Department of Planning
1 Harrison Street, S.E., 3rd Floor
Leesburg, Virginia 20177-7000



**RE: ZMAP 2006-0011/ZCPA 2006-0003, Stone Ridge Commercial
Second Submission and Response to Initial Review Comments**

Dear Stephen:

We are pleased to submit the revised ZMAP/ZCPA application for Stone Ridge Commercial with the program changes we have discussed over the past several months. While there are many moving pieces with this case, the bottom line is no additional residential units are proposed and approximately 2,400 sq.ft. of additional non-residential floor area is proposed. The main elements of this revised application are as follows:

- consolidation of previously approved residential units in Land Bays 5R and 6 on the east side of the power lines,
- expansion of the PD-IP zoning district (Land Bay 7R) on the west side of the power lines,
- redefined limits for the PD-OP (Land Bay FF2B) and R-24 (Land Bay FF1A) districts on the east side of the property to accommodate the extension of South Point Boulevard,
- proffer commitment for a time-certain delivery date of the previously proffered library space, and
- a commitment to dedicate proposed PD-IP Land Bay 8 to the County for use as a fire and/or rescue station.

Enclosed with this submission are 15 copies each of the revised Statement of Justification and the draft proffer statement, and 4 copies of the updated traffic study. Fifteen copies of the revised Application plan set will be delivered to you under separate cover.

The staff review comments are addressed below in chronological order. Each agency's comments are summarized (noted in *Italics*) and followed by our response.

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Two

Environmental Health (comments dated 9/28/06)

The Department recommends approval with the following comments/conditions to the proposal:

1. *All the lots and structures are properly served by public water and public sewer.*

Comment acknowledged.

2. *All existing wells and drainfields are shown on future plats.*

Comment acknowledged.

3. *All existing wells and drainfields are properly abandoned prior to submission of record plat or razing of the structure, whichever is first.*

Comment acknowledged.

Office of Transportation Services (comments dated 10/10/06)

1. *The proposed right-in, right out movement for Gum Spring Road at Route 50 is inconsistent with the CTP limited access policy for Route 50 and would result in weave/merge conflicts with the future Route 50/West Spine Road interchange. A more acceptable configuration would be to extend Canary Grass Drive to tie into the east-west road (Southpoint Boulevard) approved as part of the adjacent Gum Spring Village Center development, with future access to the West Spine Road south of Route 50. The Applicant should coordinate this connection with Gum Spring Village Center.*

The Application provides for the extension of former Canary Grass Drive (now South Point Drive) to tie into existing South Point Drive in the Gum Spring Village Center project. This street configuration is consistent with the eventual closure of the existing Route 659 and Route 50 intersection and median crossover.

2. *Issues with right-of-way acquisition and construction of the proposed West Spine Road between Tall Cedars Parkway and Route 50 add additional complications and uncertainty to the interim and ultimate roadway configuration in this area. Additional discussion and coordination on this matter and the overall status of the West Spine Road are necessary.*

We look forward to a meeting with OTS to discuss these matters.

3. *While the Applicant's traffic study indicates that the existing Gum Spring Road/Route 50 signalized intersection operates at LOS E during the AM peak hour, other traffic studies recently submitted to the County (e.g., Arcola Center) indicate that the intersection operates at LOS F during both the AM and PM peak hours. An explanation/clarification of this discrepancy needs to be provided.*

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Three

An updated traffic study is included with this submission.

4. *Proffered improvements to Route 50 committed to as part of the previous Stone Ridge rezoning (ZMAP 2002-0013) should also be included with this proposal as "up front" improvements as the current application is also part of Stone Ridge and would add trips to the Route 50 corridor.*

The Route 50 improvements proffered with ZMAP 2002-0013 remain in effect and will not be changed by this Application.

5. *Currently, a diamond interchange is envisioned at the intersection of the West Spine Road and Route 50. The Applicant should proffer a fair-share contribution towards this future improvement.*

The existing Stone Ridge proffers, Proffer II.I., include a cash contribution commitment for regional transportation improvements. This Application does not change the existing commitment.

6. *Staff has no issues with the proposed re-alignment of Millstream Drive, provided that the future east-west segment intersects with Route 659 Relocated at a point sufficiently south of the planned interchange of Route 659 Relocated and Route 50.*

Comment acknowledged.

7. *The inclusion of 307 additional residential units as part of this application appears to be a reversal of Board action taken with the previous Stone Ridge rezoning (ZMAP 2002-0013), in which 216 residential units were eliminated and approximately 200,000 sq.ft. of non-residential uses were instead retained.*

The Application has been revised to relocate previously approved residential units within the Property, but does not request an increase in the number of approved residential units. A modest increase in the amount of non-residential floor area is requested.

8. *An appropriate transit contribution should be provided for the 307 residential units proposed on site.*

As noted above, the revised Application proposes no increase in the number of previously approved residential units.

Department of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Management (comments dated 10/17/06)

The Fire Marshal's Office provided the following comments and recommendations:

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Four

1. The FMO advocates the use of sprinkler systems in all structures, even when not required by the International Building Code.

Comment acknowledged.

2. The burning of construction debris is strictly prohibited.

Comment acknowledged.

The Arcola Pleasant Valley Volunteer Fire and Rescue Company provided the following comments and recommendations:

1. The applicant shall require all builders to provide and install a residential fire sprinkler system for each residential unit constructed; provided that the water supply system has sufficient capacity to support the sprinkler system.

The proposed multi-family units are required by code to have sprinkler systems. Existing proffer IV.C. requires the builders of the proposed townhouse units to offer sprinkler systems as an option.

2. The applicant shall contribute an initial base sum of money of \$250 per residential unit and \$0.20 per gross square foot for non-residential buildings and shall escalate in accordance with the CPI beginning with the base year of 1988.

The Applicant's previous commitment of \$120 per residential unit and \$0.15 per square foot of non-residential floor area escalated from a base year of 1997, in accordance with the proffers approved with ZMAP 2002-0013, remains in effect for the Property.

3. Applicant shall provide all weather gravel compacted access for emergency vehicles to those portions of the project which are under construction, not later than the framing stage of construction, subject to approval of the Fire Marshal's office.

Comment acknowledged.

Environmental Review Team, Department of Building and Development (comments dated 10/18/06)

Regarding Stormwater Management

1) As shown on Sheet 3, landbay 7 and a portion of Landbay DD-1 north of Millstream Drive do not depict any SWM features. Please depict the approximate location, estimated size and type of facilities.

The locations of existing and potential SWM/BMP sites have been added to the plan set.

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Five

2) ERT recommends several measures for the existing pond south of Millstream Drive in order to minimize future maintenance expense, improve its water quality benefit, and enhance its visual appearance: install forebays at all current and future stormwater pipe outfalls; repair the vehicle ruts at the top of the embankment and mow the side slopes; establish a forested buffer along the side slopes of the existing pond.

We appreciate staff's suggestions and will consider them with future pond improvements.

Regarding Forest Resources

3) Staff recommends that trees occurring along the north side of Canary Grass Drive be identified within a tree conservation area on the CDP. The tree conservation area should include a suitable width to avoid impacting the critical root zone of the mature oak trees. For healthy trees with a diameter breast height greater than or equal to 6 inches that are damaged during construction, staff further recommends that the application commit to replacing a damaged tree with two 2.5 to 3-inch caliper native deciduous trees.

The development of this existing PD-OP land bay will endeavor to use existing trees to meet buffer yard and canopy requirements.

Loudoun County Sanitation Authority (comments dated 11/21/06)

The Sanitation Authority has reviewed the reference applications and offers no objection to their approval.

Comment acknowledged.

Community Planning, Department of Planning (comments dated 12/14/06)

A. Land Use

Staff does not support any further conversion of land from employment-related land uses to residential within the Business community portion of Stone Ridge.

The revised Application provides no increase in the number of previous approved residential units and a modest increase in the amount of non-residential floor area.

In addition to the fundamental land use issue, staff has identified additional issues:

1. *Compatibility. The applicant's proposed land bay DD2 does not take into account the stream corridor that currently defines the separation of existing residential land uses from planned employment-related land uses, and is contrary to Stone Ridge's original intent to utilize green infrastructure to separate residential and non-residential land uses. Land Bay DD is also bounded on the west by an existing 250-foot wide easement that contains underground*

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Six

transmission and high-voltage power lines. The existence of the utility easement, when combined with the natural stream corridor, makes Land Bay DD ideally suited for employment-related land uses.

The revised application proposes to relocate previous approved residential units from the west side of the power lines and from Land Bay FF1A to Land Bays 5R and 6 located to the east of the power lines. This consolidation of residential units will establish a continuous residential neighborhood in the area bounded by Tall Cedars Parkway, Stone Springs Boulevard, Millstream Drive and the power lines. The previously approved employment related uses in this area have been shifted to the west side of the power lines and consolidated with the existing non-residential zoning districts there.

2. Land Bay Consistency. Staff is requesting the applicant revise Sheet 3 of 10 in the CDP to show the boundary of Land Bay FF2 to include that portion of existing Land Bay FF2 generally shown between Stone Springs Boulevard and the existing wet pond, as identified in the CDP approved with 2002-0013. All tabulation tables in the Stone Ridge Commercial application should reflect this change.

The referenced western portion of Land Bay FF2 (now designated as Land Bay FF2A) is depicted on the plan set as it is the site of the building that contains the County's new regional library. No changes to this portion of Land Bay FF2 are proposed.

B. Density

The applicant's proposed density meets the maximum density allowed in areas planned for business land uses.

Comment acknowledged.

C. Existing Conditions

1. Stream Corridors. Staff recommends the applicant include river and stream corridor resources, including the 50-foot management buffer, on the CDP. Staff also recommends the applicant provide a minimum 100-foot buffer, inclusive of the 50-foot management buffer, along segments of the tributaries where the floodplain does not extend beyond 100 feet. Last, staff recommends the applicant commit to the protection, enhancement and long-term maintenance of the stream corridors along the two tributaries.

The Application has been revised to provide the requested 50-foot management buffer along the floodplain of the South Fork Broad Run tributary.

2. Forests, Trees and Vegetation. Staff recommends the applicant commit to protecting the overall quality of Broad Run through the preservation of existing forest and vegetation along the tributaries of the subject site to the maximum extent possible. In particular, staff supports the

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Seven

establishment of a forested buffer along the tributary and within the stream corridor adjacent to the east boundary of existing Land Bay DD in order to further buffer the non-residential and residential land use from each other and to protect the overall water quality of the Broad Run.

The revised CDP depicts tree conservation areas on Land Bays 7R, 8 and 9 adjacent to the South Fork of Broad Run and its tributaries.

D. Capital Facilities

Because of the major land use issues associated with this application, Capital Facilities have not been reviewed. If this application is considered further, staff will calculate the Capital Facilities Contributions for subsequent referrals.

The revised application proposes no increase to the number of currently approved residential units. Therefore, a capital facilities contribution is not applicable to this Application.

E. Open Space Preservation Program

Because of the major land use issues associated with this application, Open Space calculations have not been reviewed. If this application is considered further, staff will recommend contributions to the County's Open Space Program for subsequent referrals.

The revised application proposes no increase to the number of currently approved residential units. Therefore, an open space contribution is not applicable to this Application.

Zoning Administration, Department of Building and Development (comments dated 12/15/06)

II. Conformance with §6-1211 Zoning Map Amendments

1. Section 6-1211(E)1 – Whether the Proposed Zoning District Classification is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Zoning defers to Community Planning for comment.

The requested zoning districts are consistent with the Revised General Plan's Business community designation for this area.

2. Section 6-1211(E)4 – Whether adequate utility, sewer and water, transportation, school and other facilities exist or can be provided to serve the uses that would be permitted on the Property if it were rezoned. Staff defers to Community Planning, OTS, School Board, Library Services, and Parks and Recreation.

All infrastructure needed to support this application is either in place or is provided by the application.

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Eight

3. *Section 6-1211(E)6 – The effect of uses allowed by the proposed rezoning on the structural capacity of the soils. According to County records, hydric soils (types 66A and 69A) are present in the rezoning area. Staff notes that the soils type is not included on Sheet 5. Please correct this.*

Soils information is provided on Sheets 8 and 9.

4. *Section 6-1211(E)7 – The impact that the uses that would be permitted if the property were rezoned will have upon the volume of vehicular and pedestrian traffic and traffic safety in the vicinity and whether the proposed rezoning uses sufficient measures to mitigate the impact of through construction traffic on existing neighborhoods and school areas. Staff would recommend more specific measures to mitigate the impact of construction traffic on the surrounding area. The applicant should also address how construction traffic will enter and exit the property during construction.*

We respectfully point out that the properties subject to this rezoning request are currently zoned for significant development that would also introduce occasional construction traffic to the local streets.

5. *Section 6-1211(E)9 – The effect of the proposed rezoning on environmentally sensitive land or natural features, wildlife habitat, vegetation, water quality and air quality. Zoning encourages the preservation of all existing wetlands and riparian corridors whenever possible. Staff recommends that the Applicant identify areas of existing vegetation that will be preserved and show such areas on a proffered plan. Staff defers to ERT for further comment.*

The CDP has been revised to depict areas of tree conservation along riparian corridors.

III. Conformance with R-16 District

The rezoning plan set should state in the Notes section that Land Bay DD2 will be developed in accord with all regulations for the R-16 zoning district.

The revised CDP proposes that a portion of existing Land Bay DD be rezoned to PD-H4 (Land Bay 5R) and to R-16 (Land Bay 6). The R-16 district regulations apply to Land Bay 6.

1. *On Sheet 3, the Applicant has depicted the lot requirements for both multi-family (R-16) and townhouses (R-8). However, staff believes the Applicant is only proposing a rezoning to R-16 in Land Bay DD2 and not to R-8. Correct/clarify this.*

Sheet 4 includes the zoning regulations for the zoning districts requested, R-16 and PD-H4 (administered as R-8).

2. *Demonstrate conformance with Section 3-602 regarding pedestrian linkages to employment and shopping centers. This Section also requires that the district is served by public transit.*

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Nine

The CDP has been revised to depict the locations of the existing and proposed pedestrian linkages.

3. *On Sheet 3, note the maximum permitted density of 19.2 dwelling units per acre in the R-16 zoning district as well as the proposed density for Land Bay DD1.*

The requested information has been added to Sheet 4 in the R-16 district zoning requirements.

4. *On Sheet 3, depict the maximum length/width ratio as required by Section 3-606(D).*

The requested information has been added to Sheet 4 in the R-16 district zoning requirements.

5. *With regard to Section 3-608(B), staff asks that either detailed drawings be submitted with this application or provide a note that this requirement will be evaluated at the time of site plan.*

Compliance with all applicable zoning regulations will be demonstrated at the time of site plan.

6. *On the CDP, provide the required amount of active recreation space pursuant to Section 7-903(E). Designate on the CDP the location and types of active recreation uses and include this in the Proffer Statement.*

The requested tabulation has been added to Sheet 4. The CDP has been revised to depict the location of the major recreational amenities, which are described in the proffer statement.

7. *Demonstrate compliance with Section 3-608(B) of the Ordinance, which requires that no off street parking for multi-family dwellings shall be permitted in areas between buildings and streets, unless such parking areas are sufficiently bermed and screened so that the parking areas are not visible from the street.*

Appropriate screening of parking areas for compliance with this requirement will be demonstrated at the time of site plan.

8. *Include a note on the CDP that residences to be served by private roads shall be subject to a recorded covenant regarding the private maintenance of such roads (Section 3-610(C)).*

Section 3-610 requires such disclosure in a recorded covenant and in sales information, as well as on the record plats.

IV. Conformance with R-24 District

The rezoning plan set should state in the Notes section that Land Bay FF1 will be developed in accord with all regulations for the R-24 zoning district.

Comment acknowledged. The revised CDP designates the R-24 district as Land Bay FF1A.

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Ten

1. *On Sheet 3, please include the correct ordinance section of the R-24 ADU district, 7-1000, not 7-900.*

This correction has been made to the R-24 district regulations on Sheet 5.

2. *Land Bay FFI is approved for 640 multi-family units with ZMAP 1994-0017. A portion of this Land Bay (Section 17) is proposed for 304 multi-family units with STPL 2005-0081/SPAM 2006-0079. The remainder of the land is proposed for 322 multi-family units with this application. Clarify the difference in the total number of units for the land bay.*

The Application proposes to reduce the number of multi-family units permitted in Land Bay FF1A from 321 to 158. Existing Section 17 (not part of the Application) will retain its entitlement of 304 multi-family units. The area previously identified as Land Bay FF1 will, therefore, have a total unit count of 462 multi-family units. The reduction of 163 units in Land Bay FF1A is off-set by the 163 residential units in Land Bay 6.

3. *The Applicant must demonstrate that the application meets the following five requirements of Section 3-702 of the Ordinance:*

(A) *Abutting arterials and major collectors. Direct access for lots created after the adoption of this ordinance to such arterials and major collectors shall be provided only via minor collector roads.*

None of the proposed lots will have direct access to any arterial or major collector roads.

(B) *With pedestrian linkages to planned or existing employment centers, shopping or community support services.*

Pedestrian links to the Stone Ridge shopping and employment areas are depicted on the CDP.

(C) *Consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.*

The R-24 district is consistent with the residential component of Business communities and the currently approved CDP provides for a larger R-24 district and more units than what is proposed with this Application.

(D) *When supporting shopping and commercial development is planned, existing or under construction.*

Stone Ridge includes an existing shopping center and several planned employment areas.

(E) *Planned or served by public transit, or designated for public transit in the Comprehensive Plan.*

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Eleven

Stone Ridge includes a commuter parking facility within its shopping center on Millstream Drive.

Staff asks the Applicant to clarify if the existing Route 659 adjacent to the R-24 district is classified as major collector or a local road.

The CTP classifies the existing 2-lane section of Route 659 adjacent to the proposed R-24 district as a major collector. Please see CTP page A1-47 for the "Old Route 659" description.

The difference between trails and sidewalks shown on Sheet 8 is not clear. Staff suggests a sidewalk and/or trail be provided along Canary Grass Drive and Route 659. Staff also suggests that the applicant provide and depict internal pedestrian crosswalks and signals at major intersections to create a safe and functional pedestrian network.

As shown on Sheets 5 and 11, sidewalks will be provided on both sides of South Point Drive (formerly Canary Grass Drive) and will connect with the existing trail system on Millstream Drive.

Please coordinate with OTS to determine the need for bus stops and shelters within the R-24 district.

Comment acknowledged.

4. On the CDP, provide the required amount of active recreation space pursuant to Section 7-1003(E). The Applicant must demonstrate that active recreation space is accessible to all residents by means of internal pedestrian walkways.

In addition to the existing active recreation facilities within Stone Ridge, a multi-family community center, including a swimming pool, is proposed in Land Bay FF1A.

5. On the CDP, the Applicant should note the maximum length/width ratio of the district pursuant to Section 3-706(D).

This information is provided on Sheet 5.

6. Include the requirement of Section 3-707(C) regarding the maximum number of units per building.

This information is provided on Sheet 5.

7. The Applicant should demonstrate conformance with Section 3-708(B), off-street parking, at the time of site plan.

Comment acknowledged.

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Twelve

8. Denote the permitted and proposed density for the R-24 zoning district on the CDP.

The CDP has been revised as requested.

V. Conformance with the PD-IP, Planned Development-Industrial Park District

The rezoning plan set should state in the Notes section that Land Bay 7 will be developed in accord with all PD-IP regulations.

The revised CDP designates Land Bays 7R and 8 for development under the PD-IP regulations.

1. *A minimum yard of 75 feet is required adjacent to the PD-H4 zoning district (Section 4-505(B)(2). See part IX of this referral for comments on the requested modification of this section.*

A modification of the referenced section is no longer needed. The proposed PD-IP land bays are separated from the existing and proposed PD-H4 districts by a stream corridor to the west, the 120-foot wide Tall Cedars Parkway right-of-way to the south and the existing PD-IP open space land bay (Land Bay ZZ) to the east.

2. *Staff asks that the Applicant provide a detailed illustrative to demonstrate compliance with Sections 4-505(B)(4) and 4-507 or provide a note stating that these requirements will be met at site plan.*

Notes have been added to the CDP stating that compliance with all applicable zoning ordinance regulations will be demonstrated at the time of site plan.

3. *On Sheet 3, note the maximum lot coverage and building height as required by Ordinance as well as maximums proposed by the Applicant.*

The PD-IP zoning regulations are provided on Sheet 4.

4. *On Sheet 3, include a note stating the minimum landscaped open space requirement of Section 4-507(B).*

The PD-IP zoning regulations are provided on Sheet 4.

VI. Conformance with the PD-OP, Planned Development-Office Park District

The rezoning plan set should state in the Notes section that Land Bays DD1 and FF2 will be developed in accord with all PD-OP regulations.

The revised Application proposes to rezone portions of PD-IP Land Bay DD to PD-H4 (Land Bay 5R) and R-16 (Land Bay 6).

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Thirteen

1. Staff recommends that the applicant provide an illustrative drawing depicting the objectives of Section 4-301, Purpose.

The CDP depicts the developable areas of the PD-OP land bay, but a specific layout is not available at this time.

2. Direct access onto arterial roads shall be limited to those consistent with adopted Corridor Plans, Section 4-302. Staff defers to OTS regarding the proposed access to Route 50.

The PD-OP area (Land Bay FF2B) has no direct access to Route 50.

3. Demonstrate conformance with Section 4-302 regarding incremental additions to a PD-OP district.

The incremental addition will become part of Stone Ridge and will be developed in conjunction with the adjacent PD-OP districts in Stone Ridge.

4. On the CDP, depict the 100-foot minimum yard adjacent to the R-24 and R-16 zoning districts, Section 305(B)(2). Also depict and label the 50-foot yard required for parking. See part IX of this referral for comments on the requested modification of this section.

A modification has been requested to reduce the 100-foot zoning district line setback for Land Bay FF2B.

5. On the CDP, depict the 15-foot minimum yard adjacent to the PD-IP and PD-CC(CC) zoning districts, Section 4-305(B)(3).

This minimum yard for Land Bay FF2B is depicted adjacent to the CLI zoning district.

6. Denote the required minimum landscape open space per lot on the CDP.

The PD-OP zoning regulations are provided on Sheet 5.

7. Staff asks that the Applicant provide a detailed illustrative to demonstrate compliance with Section 4-307(E) or provide a note stating that these requirements will be met at site plan.

Notes have been added to the CDP stating that compliance with all applicable zoning ordinance regulations will be demonstrated at the time of site plan.

VII. Conformance with Article VII Regulations, Affordable Housing

The Applicant is proposing to add an additional 307 multi-family units in proposed Land Bay DD2 including 20 ADU units. Staff asks that the Applicant clarify that an additional 21 ADUs will

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Fourteen

be provided with the R-24 zoning district shown on this application (Land Bay FF1, per approved ZMAP 1994-0017, STPL 2005-0081, SPAM 2006-0079).

The Application has been revised and now shows no increase in the number of previously approved residential units for Stone Ridge.

The Applicant must note that ADUs shall be of a building type and of an architectural style compatible with residential units permitted within the zoning district and interspersed among market rate units in the proposed development.

Compliance with this requirement will be demonstrated at the time of site plan, in accordance with Article 7.

VIII. Conformance with Zoning Overlay District Regulations

Section 4-1400, Airport Impact (AI) Overlay District

a) The Plan needs to be revised to show the existing zoning of the property to also include the AI district (Note #1, Sheet 1). Also correct note #14 on Sheet 1.

Note 14 on Sheet 1 provides the requested AI district information and the plan set depicts the location of the Ldn 60 noise contour.

b) Indicate compliance with Section 4-1404(B).

Note 14 on Sheet 1 indicates that the Property is subject to Section 4-1400.

c) Add the Disclosure Statement of Section 4-1405 in the note section.

Section 4-1405 requires an AI District Disclosure to be placed on all subdivision plats, site plans and deeds for any parcel subject to Section 4-1402(B), and such Disclosure will be provided.

IX. Conformance with Section 6-1500, PD District

1. Section 6-1505, CDP Submission Requirements. The proposed CDP does not provide any detail with regard to layout, design, phasing, etc., for the proposed PD-OP and PD-IP zoning districts, Section 6-1505(A), and Staff asks that the Applicant address this.

The layout, design and phasing of the proposed PD-OP and PD-IP land bays is not available at this time. The revised Application proposes a floor area increase of only 2,400 sq.ft. for the non-residential districts.

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Fifteen

2. Section 6-1504, Zoning Modifications. Staff asks that the Applicant clarify the nature of the proposed modifications of Section 4-305(B)(2) and Section 4-505(B)(2) on Sheet 3 and to provide justification for such modifications.

The revised Statement of Justification provided with this submission includes justification for the requested zoning ordinance modification.

3. Section 6-1508, Contents of an approved CDP

The CDP must be revised to depict the following for the PD-OP and PD-IP districts:

A. Nonresidential density. For nonresidential development, (c) the proposed setbacks, height and bulk restrictions for the project as a whole or for components or sub areas within the project. In addition, non-residential development plans shall specify any applicable performance standards that are imposed and restrictions regarding the location and nature of industrial, commercial and other nonresidential activities.

The PD-IP and PD-OP zoning district requirements are depicted on the CDP.

D. Transportation/Access. For nonresidential development, the approved location and general design of transportation improvements and ingress and egress to the project, along with such access restrictions as are imposed to promote and ensure the integrity and function of the County's thoroughfare system and the safe and efficient circulation of vehicles and pedestrians with the Planned Development district.

The road network within Stone Ridge has been coordinated with the Countywide Transportation Plan.

E. Perimeter treatment. The CDP must demonstrate the design and arrangement of perimeter area and how it mitigates the impact of the project upon adjoining properties.

The CDP depicts the location and extent of the requisite perimeter buffers.

X. Conformance with Additional Regulations & Standards

A. Section 5-1100, Off-Street Parking & Loading Requirements. Staff recommends that the required and proposed parking and loading spaces for all uses be provided at this time, otherwise, a note should be provided on the plat stating that parking will be provided at the time of site plan and will conform to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Notes have been added to the CDP stating that compliance with all applicable zoning ordinance regulations will be demonstrated at the time of site plan.

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Sixteen

B. Section 5-1300, Tree Planting and Replacement. Since this site has existing vegetation, the applicant should ensure and proffer that existing viable stands of trees will be preserved to the greatest extent possible and depict this on the CDP.

Tree conservation areas are depicted on the CDP.

C. Section 5-1400, Buffering and Screening.

1. The presentation and approval of a landscape plan is addressed at site plan. However, comments on the utilization of existing vegetation to meet buffer planting requirements should be placed in the Notes.

Existing vegetation will be utilized where practicable to meet buffer planting requirements.

2. The Applicant will have the option of requesting a modification or waiver of the required buffer yard by the Zoning Administrator at the time of site plan, pursuant to Section 5-1409, unless a specific condition of approval is added prohibiting such a request.

Comment acknowledged.

D. Section 5-1200, Signs. Unless modified, all signage shall comply with this section, to include the Sign Requirements Matrix, Section 5-1204(D). Please include a note to that effect on Sheet 1.

Signage in Stone Ridge is subject to an approved Comprehensive Sign Plan.

XI. ZMAP Checklist

1. The Applicant has depicted some but not all required open space areas in the development (Sheet 7). Staff notes that the proposed open space areas primarily consist of perimeter buffers and floodplain areas. Clarify and describe the character of the open space and any proposed active recreation (R-16, R-24 district) on the CDP sheet.

The proposed community centers for the R-16 and R-24 land bays are depicted on the CDP and described in the proffer statement.

XII. Proffer Statement

1. The Applicant has not provided any proffers to date.

A draft proffer statement is provided with this submission.

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Seventeen

2. Staff recommends that each proffer be written to communicate; 1) the intent of the proffer; 2) who is responsible for fulfilling the proffer; 3) what is being proffered; 4) where the proffer applies; and 5) when the proffer is to be initiated and completed.

Comment acknowledged.

3. Staff asks the Applicant to address how the proposed application relates to the existing approved Stone Ridge development and to provide a draft proffer statement clarifying any new proffers, deletion or revision of existing ones, etc.

The Applicant is the developer of Stone Ridge and will coordinate the development of the Application Property with the rest of Stone Ridge. A draft proffer statement is provided with this submission.

XIII. Other Issues/Comments

1. On the Rezoning Plat (Sheet 2), the zoning of MCPI# 204-18-0633 is R-24, not Transition. Please depict the correct zoning district.

This notation has been corrected as requested.

2. On the information Sheet, it is noted that a portion of tax map number 100/37 is proposed to be rezoned to the CLI district. This is not depicted or labeled on the rezoning plat. Explain.

The CDP has been revised and now depicts the included parcels and proposed zoning districts.

3. On the Rezoning Plat (Sheet 2), clarify that MCPI# 205-36-2224 is zoned R-24, PD-OP, R-16 and PDH-4, and that only the portion zoned R-24 and PD-OP is being rezoned and note the acreage on the Table on Sheet 2.

The table on Sheet 2 notes the area of each parcel, or portion of a parcel, to be rezoned, and the existing and proposed zoning districts.

4. On the Rezoning Plat(Sheet 2), identify the portion of the existing right-of-way that is proposed to rezone from PD-IP to PD-OP and R-16.

The Rezoning Plat has been revised as requested.

5. The property contains areas of steep slopes. Include a note on the Cover Sheet in the notes section that development of the property will conform to the steep slope standards of Section 5-1508.

Note 17 on the Cover Sheet addresses this comment.

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Eighteen

6. *For ease of clarification, denote and label the existing parcel lines and zoning boundaries as well as proposed zoning district boundaries on a separate sheet.*

The requested information is provided on Sheets 2 and 3.

7. *Clarify the proposed zoning of the VEPCO easement adjacent to MCPI# 204-35-8501 and provide an acreage breakdown of the different zoning districts for the parcel including the VEPCO easement area.*

The VEPCO easement area, along with the existing and proposed zoning districts and their areas, is shown on Sheet 2.

8. *The Parcel containing MCPI# 204-39-3236 according to County records indicate that the parcel is zoned PD-GI and is not at the location shown on the proposed CDP. Similarly, for MCPI# 204-39-4010, 205-36-2224, 204-40-4123. Correct/clarify this. Please correct this on the Table on Sheet 2.*

The plats and tables on Sheets 2 and 3 have been revised.

9. *Depict and label the existing Canary Grass Court on the proposed CDP (adjacent to the R-24 district).*

South Point Drive (formerly Canary Grass Court) is labeled on Sheet 5 of the CDP.

10. *For ease of clarification, depict and label Amber Spring Court on the proposed CDP.*

Amber Spring Court is labeled on Sheet 5.

11. *On Sheet 3, in the "Proposed Development Program" table, the Applicant depicted the proposed number of units for Land Bay FF1 as 322, while on the same sheet, in the location of the proposed land bay, the Applicant noted 213 multi-family units. Correct/clarify this inconsistency.*

A Density Exchange Table is provided on Sheet 5 to reflect the relocation of previously approved residential and non-residential uses.

12. *On Sheet 3, in the "Proposed Development Program" table, remove the proposed FAR of 0.40 from the residential land bays as it is not applicable.*

Sheet 3 has been revised to address this comment.

13. *The application must clearly distinguish and label the public and private streets in the development.*

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Nineteen

All access drives within townhouse and multi-family areas will be private. All subdivision streets will be/are public streets.

14. On Sheet 7, the calculation of open space for the R-24, R-16 is based on a required open space of 10%. Staff asks that the Applicant clarify this, as the 10% minimum is not an Ordinance requirement.

Sheet 7 is now an existing conditions map.

15. On Sheet 7, in the notes section, correct the word "maintained" as it is incorrectly spelled.

Sheet 7 is now an existing conditions map.

16. On Sheet 8, Land Bays 7, DD1 and DD2 are labeled as Land Bays AA, BB and CC. Please correct/clarify this inconsistency.

Sheet 8 is now a soils map.

17. According to the County's Weblogis, the area of MCPI# 204-36-8501 is 69.36 acres with the major portion zoned PD-IP and a small portion (14.67 acres) zoned PD-H4. Please clarify on the Table on Sheet 2 that the existing zoning of this parcel is also PD-H4.

The tables on Sheet 2 and 3 address only those areas that are proposed to be rezoned.

Virginia Department of Transportation (comments dated 2/23/07)

1. Please provide draft proffers for review.

Draft proffers are provided with this submission.

2. Applicant should dedicate right of way and construct Route 50 improvements consistent with one-half of the ultimate section specified in the CTP to a point where they tie-in with other compatible, proffered improvements (either by this developer or by others).

All previous proffer commitments for Route 50 improvements are retained.

3. Applicant should dedicate right of way and construct Relocated Route 659 and the West Spine Road and Tall Cedars Parkway per the ultimate conditions as specified in the CTP at least through the limits of Stone Ridge property and preferably to a point where they tie-in with other compatible, proffered improvements (either by this developer or by others).

This Application proposes the construction of a portion of Northstar Boulevard (formerly Relocated Route 659) in addition to the previous commitments for other regional road improvements.

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Twenty

4. *The applicant should provide a pro-rata monetary contribution to be applied towards area transportation improvements.*

The current proffers commit to regional transportation contributions.

5. *Please clearly label Relocated Route 659 as such on the plan sheets.*

The CDP has been revised as requested.

6. *Dimension distance from Realigned Millstream Drive/Relocated Route 659 intersection to the closest intersections to the north and south. Ensure adequate crossover spacing on Relocated Route 659 as identified in the CTP.*

Millstream Drive is relocated with this Application and no longer intersects with Relocated Route 659.

7. *The traffic impact study (TIA) needs to be revised to include a "Recommendations" Section. A complete and thorough review cannot be conducted until this aspect of the TIA is completed. Receipt of this information may generate additional comments.*

An updated TIA is provided. It is noted that this Application proposes no additional residential units and only 2,400 sq.ft. of additional non-residential floor area.

8. *All traffic signals and signal modifications costs associated with this application are to be borne by the applicant. Verbiage to this effect should be included in the proffers.*

The existing proffers include commitments for specific traffic signals.

9. *Have designs been submitted/approved for the ultimate planned interchanges at Route 50/West Spine Road and at Route 50/659 Relocated?*

Not to our knowledge.

10. *Related to comment #9. This application should dedicate any necessary right of way and provide monetary contribution towards design/construction of the cited interchanges.*

Neither interchange impacts the Application Property. Stone Ridge has an existing proffer commitment for regional transportation contributions that will be applied to the Application Property.

11. *The north-south traffic volume on Gum Spring Road, Route 659, is significant. This roadway should not be abandoned or terminated or realigned until an adequate replacement facility is in place. There is a note on sheet 8 of 10 that we recommend be directly incorporated in to the proffers for this application.*

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Twenty-One

Existing Gum Spring Road cannot be abandoned until VDOT authorizes such abandonment.

12. We recommend transportation demand management (TDM) measures be incorporated into the proffers for the office portion of this application.

The existing proffers include commitments for contributions to support the County's Transportation Demand Management Program.

13. Provide typical sections for Millstream Drive and Canary Grass Drive.

Please see Sheet 15.

14. Please see attached email dated 9/29/06.

Comment acknowledged.

15. Please see attached email dated 9/15/06.

Comment acknowledged.

16. Please see attached email dated 8/28/06.

Comment acknowledged.

Parks, Recreation and Community Services (comments dated 4/25/07)

1. Please provide proffers for review.

Draft proffers are provided with this submission.

2. The Applicant should demonstrate how the recreational and leisure needs of these new residents will be met without further taxing the existing public recreational facilities in eastern Loudoun.

The Application has been revised to propose no increase in the number of previously approved residential units for Stone Ridge. All residents of Stone Ridge have access to private recreational amenities.

3. Commercial, office and industrial developments based on their zoning are potential areas where facilities such as athletic fields (lighted) could be co-located.

Stone Ridge has previously dedicated the County's 25-acre Byrne's Ridge Park on Stone Springs Boulevard, as well as the Mercer Middle School and Arcola Elementary School sites, all of which have several athletic fields.

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Twenty-Two

4. *PRCS recommends that all internal sidewalks be a minimum of 5 feet.*

Comment acknowledged.

5. *On Sheet 8 of the Concept Plan, the Applicant is proposing an extension of the trail system throughout the Stone Ridge community. PRCS requests the Applicant to provide a typical section, including width and surface type, of each of the types of trails proposed and their locations. PRCS recommends that the trail proposed along Tall Cedars Parkway be a 10-foot wide, paved shared bicycle/pedestrian trail, and that the trail along the South Fork Broad Run be a natural pedestrian trail only.*

The width and surface type of the proposed trails will be consistent with FSM requirements and will be determined at the time of site development to be consistent with the existing trail network within Stone Ridge.

6. and 7. *PRCS would like to discuss with the Applicant a potential opportunity for dedication of the South Fork Broad Run flood plain to the County as a linear stream valley park. Staff is currently coordinating with other proposed area project applicants on both sides of the South Fork Broad Run for a potential contiguous linear stream valley park.*

Staff may contact the Applicant at any time to discuss this matter. It has been the Applicant's intent to retain the passive park in the TR-1UBF land bay as an HOA amenity.

8. *Staff requests the opportunity to discuss with the Applicant potential options for providing a much-needed restroom facility at Byrne's Ridge Park.*

Staff may contact the Applicant at any time to discuss this matter.

Stephen Gardner
January 27, 2009
Page Twenty-Three

We believe this response letter, the draft proffers, the revised Statement of Justification and the amended application plans address all staff comments. We look forward to continuing to work with you on this Application.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Cooley Godward Kronish LLP



Jeffrey A. Nein, AICP
Senior Land Use Planner

Enclosures

cc: Roy R. Barnett, Van Metre Companies
Brian Martin, P. E., Urban, Ltd.
Antonio Calabrese, Esq., Cooley Godward Kronish LLP

322220 v1/RE